



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,046	12/02/2003	Kailash K. Mutha	LUC-430/Mutha 1	2678
32205	7590	10/09/2007	EXAMINER	
PATTI, HEWITT & AREZINA LLC ONE NORTH LASALLE STREET 44TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60602			DAFTUAR, SAKET K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

80

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/726,046	MUTHA, KAILASH K.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Saket K. Daftuar	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are presented for the examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The language of claims 1-14 and 21 raises a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C 101.

Claims 1 and 21 are not limited to any particular apparatus or an article but may be practiced with any such suitable software program or instruction. Therefore, claims 1 and 21 fail under 35 U.S.C 101 for being a software program or instruction, which fails to show any functional relationship between the computer or hardware components.

Claim 1 recite a limitation, "one or more server components that employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router

components, wherein the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of: a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; and a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices” ,that does not clearly states use of hardware in claim language. However, claim does indicate that there are servers and routers but failed to show the use of server and router’s communication or failed to show the use of server communicating with routers in claim language. Based on the claim language, it appears to be merely an abstract idea. Therefore, claim 1 is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 2-14 dependent upon independent claim 1 and therefore, claims 2-14 are rejected under same scope as discussed in claim 1, supra.

Claim 21 recite a limitation, “means in the one or more media for searching one or more databases, with one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components; and means in the one or media for sending one or more messages, or calls to the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components for direction to the one or more communication devices”, that does not clearly states use of hardware communication in claim language. However, claim does indicate that there are

servers, databases and routers but failed to show the use of hardware communication or failed to show the use of server communicating with routers and databases in claim language. Based on the claim language, it appears to be merely an abstract idea. Therefore, claim 1 is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 21 also recites an article comprising one or more computer – readable signal bearing media. Page 16 of specification, " In one example, the computer-readable signal-bearing medium comprises a modulated carrier signal transmitted over a network comprising or coupled with the apparatus 100, for instance, one or more of a telephone network, a local area network ("LAN"), the internet, and a wireless network", provided evidence that applicant intends the medium to include signals as such the claim is drawn to a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore claim 30 is not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Energy is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not combination of substances and therefore, energy is not a composition of matter and hence, claim 30 is directed to non-statutory subject matter since they are not tangible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 5-11, 14-15, and 19-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar et al U.S. Patent Number 6,324,582 B1 (hereinafter Sridhar) and Thompson et al U.S. Publication Number 2002/0075304 A1 (hereinafter Thompson).

As per claim 1, Sridhar discloses one or more server [see figure 6, blocks 616, 630, 640] components that employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices [router 614, 622] to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components (Abstract, column 5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29).

However, Sridhar is silent about the user identifier being a phone number, an email address, an Instant message name and user name.

Thompson teaches that the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of: a phone number [respective unique dial numbers in the switched telephone network] for one or more users [team] associated with the one or more communication devices (see paragraph 0011, 0031, 0083 PSTN destination number, IP address, e-mail address for each communication device identified by the respective team member in their current personal profile); an email address

for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices (see paragraph 0011, 0031, 0083 PSTN destination number, IP address, e-mail address for each communication device identified by the respective team member in their current personal profile) ; an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices (see paragraph 0011, 0031, 0083, 0086, and 0107-0108 team member communicating with other person or team members through instant messaging, email, voice and multi-media communications and the telephone number of the team member's home telephone hand-set and the IP and e-mail addresses of the team member's home PC are included in the communications preferences information to enable establishment of text and voice communications sessions); and a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices (see paragraph 0011, 0031, 0083, 0086, and 0107-0108 team member communicating with other person or team members through instant messaging, email, voice and multi-media communications and the telephone number of the team member's home telephone hand-set and the IP and e-mail addresses of the team member's home PC are included in the communications preferences information to enable establishment of text and voice communications sessions).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar and Thompson, as they both are from same field endeavor, to provide a scalable

system for point to point data streaming, to allow average internet users to deliver their own video or other streaming data over the Internet at minimal setup for a low cost, to provide remote monitoring that allows user to leave the viewer available web page but does not use network bandwidth until the user starts the stream from within the viewer controls and to provide a built in session tracking system separate from any web server and giving the user direct control over the video stream they are accessing.

As per claim 2, Sridhar discloses the one or more server components employ the one or more identifiers to search one or more databases to make the determination of the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components (column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14)

As per claim 5, Sridhar discloses upon the determination by the one or more server components of the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components, one or more of the one or more server components communicate one or more messages or calls through the internet to the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components (column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14).

As per claim 6 and 20, Sridhar discloses one or more server components that employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to

make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components, wherein the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of: a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; and a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices.

However, Sridhar is silent about one or more of the one or more messages or calls comprise one or more video messages.

As per claim 6 and 20, Thompson teaches the apparatus of claim 5, wherein one or more of the one or more messages or calls comprise one or more video messages wherein the one or more of the one or more server components communicate the one or more video messages through the internet to one or more of the one or more internet protocol address of one or more of the one or more router components (see paragraph 0010, 0037,0078)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar and Thompson, as they both are from same field endeavor, to provide a scalable system for point to point data streaming, to allow average internet users to deliver their own video or other streaming data over the Internet at minimal setup for a low cost, to provide remote monitoring that allows user to leave the viewer

available web page but does not use network bandwidth until the user starts the stream from within the viewer controls and to provide a built in session tracking system separate from any web server and giving the user direct control over the video stream they are accessing.

As per claim 7, Sridhar discloses one or more second server components that employ the one or more identifiers of the one or more communication devices to direct the one or more messages or calls through the one or more router components to the one or more communication devices (column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14).

As per claim 8, Sridhar discloses one or more of the one or more second server components employ one or more screening preferences of one or more of the one or more users associated with one or more of the one or more communication devices to direct one or more of the one or more messages or calls to the one or more of the one or more communication devices (column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14).

As per claim 9, Sridhar discloses t the one or more screening preferences are stored in one or more databases (Abstract, column5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29), wherein the one or more of the one or more second server components employ the one or more of the one or more

messages or calls to perform a search of the one or more screening preferences [database directory, column 17, lines 40-58], wherein the one or more of the one or more second server components employ one or more results of the search to direct the one or more of the one or more messages to the one or more of the one or more communication devices (Abstract, column 5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14).

As per claims 10 and 11, Sridhar discloses one or more server components that employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components, wherein the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of: a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices ; an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; and a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices.

However, Sridhar is silent about one or more of the one or more router components are coupled with a landline telephone network and one or more of the one or more router components are coupled with a mobile network.

As per claims 10 and 11, Thompson teaches one or more of the one or more router components are coupled with a landline [wired telephone] telephone

network and one or more of the one or more router components are coupled with a mobile [wireless communication network] network (see paragraph 0078 and figure 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar and Thompson, as they both are from same field endeavor, to provide a scalable system for point to point data streaming, to allow average internet users to deliver their own video or other streaming data over the Internet at minimal setup for a low cost, to provide remote monitoring that allows user to leave the viewer available web page but does not use network bandwidth until the user starts the stream from within the viewer controls and to provide a built in session tracking system separate from any web server and giving the user direct control over the video stream they are accessing.

As per claim 14, Sridhar discloses wherein the one or more first server components employ the one or more identifiers to search one or more databases to make the determination of the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components (Abstract, column5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14)); wherein upon the determination by the one or more first server components of the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components, one or more

of the one or more first server components communicate one or more messages or calls through the internet to the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components (Abstract, column 5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14); the apparatus further comprising: one or more second server components (Abstract, column 5, line 5 – column 6, line 20); wherein upon receipt of the one or more messages or calls at the one or more router components, the one or more second server components employ the one or more identifiers of the one or more communication devices to direct the one or more [command messages such as abort message goes through gateway device to remote server] messages or calls through the one or more router components to the one or more communication devices (Abstract, column 5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14, column 14, line 49 – column 15, line 7).

As per claim 15, Sridhar discloses searching one or more databases (column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29), with one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components (Abstract, column 5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14); and sending one or more messages (column 14, line 49 – column 15, line 7 and

Figure 6; sending command messages such as abort message via gateway communicating device), or calls to the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components for direction to the one or more communication devices.

As per claim 19, Sridhar discloses the method of claim 15, wherein the one or more databases comprise one or more first databases, wherein the step of sending the one or more messages or calls to the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components for direction to the one or more communication devices comprises the steps of: searching one or more second databases to direct one or more of the one or more messages or calls to one or more of the one or more communication devices (Abstract, column5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 14, line 49 – column 15, line 7; column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14); directing the one or more of the one or more communication messages to the one or more of the one or more communication devices through employment of one or more of the one or more identifiers and one or more message screening preferences [database directory, column 17, lines 40-58], of one or more users of the one or more communication devices (Abstract, column5, line 5 – column 6, line 20, column 14, line 49 – column 15, line 7; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14).

As per claim 21, claim 21 is an article claim of method claim 15. Claim 21 does not teach or further define over the limitation as recited in claim 15. Therefore, claim 21 rejected under same scopes as discussed in claim 15, supra.

6. Claims 3-4 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar and Thompson as applied to claims 1-2, 5-11, 14-15, and 19-21 above, and further in view of Conrath U.S. Patent Number 7,103,770 B2 (hereinafter Conrath).

As per claims 3 and 4, Sridhar discloses one or more server components that employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components, wherein the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of: a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; and a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices.

However, Sridhar is silent about the Internet protocol not being static and dynamic address.

As per claim 3, Conrath teaches wherein one or more of the one or more server components search one or more of the one or more databases to make a

determination of the one or more dynamic internet protocol addresses of the one or more of the one or more router components (column 1, line 60 – 2, line 6).

As per claim 4, Conrath teaches wherein one or more of the one or more server components search one or more of the one or more databases to make a determination of the one or more static internet protocol addresses of the one or more of the one or more router components (column 1, line 60 – 2, line 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar, Thompson and Conrath, as they all are from same field endeavor, to provide a scalable system for point to point data streaming, to allow average internet users to deliver their own video or other streaming data over the Internet at minimal setup for a low cost, to provide remote monitoring that allows user to leave the viewer available web page but does not use network bandwidth until the user starts the stream from within the viewer controls and to provide a built in session tracking system separate from any web server and giving the user direct control over the video stream they are accessing.

As per claims 16 and 17, Sridhar discloses searching one or more databases, with one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components; and sending one or more messages, or calls to the one or

more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components for direction to the one or more communication devices.

However, Sridhar is silent about the Internet protocol not being static and dynamic address.

As per claim 16, Conrath teaches determination of the one or more dynamic internet protocol addresses of the one or more of the one or more router components (column 1, line 60 – 2, line 6); and sending one or more of the one or more messages or calls through the internet to the one or more dynamic internet protocol addresses of the one or more of the one or more router components (column 1, line 60 – 2, line 6 and column 9, lines 4-13 for messaging using Internet address and TCP ports that support static and dynamic IP addresses).

As per claim 17, Conrath teaches determination of the one or more static internet protocol addresses of the one or more of the one or more router components (column 1, line 60 – 2, line 6); and sending one or more of the one or more messages or calls through the internet to the one or more static internet protocol addresses of the one or more of the one or more router components (column 1, line 60 – 2, line 6 and column 9, lines 4-13 for messaging using Internet address and TCP ports that support static and dynamic IP addresses).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar, Thompson and Conrath, as they all are from same field endeavor, to provide a

scalable system for point to point data streaming, to allow average internet users to deliver their own video or other streaming data over the Internet at minimal setup for a low cost, to provide remote monitoring that allows user to leave the viewer available web page but does not use network bandwidth until the user starts the stream from within the viewer controls and to provide a built in session tracking system separate from any web server and giving the user direct control over the video stream they are accessing.

7. Claims 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Thompson, and Conrath as applied to claims 1- 11, 14-17, and 19-21 above, and further in view of Brooks et al U.S. Patent Number 7, 047,305 B1 (hereinafter Brooks).

As per claims 12 and 18, Sridhar discloses one or more server components that employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components, wherein the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of: a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; and a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices.

However, Sridhar is silent about one or more of the one or more communication devices comprise one or more smart appliances with one or more functions and one or more functions of the one or more smart appliances through direction of one or more of the one or more messages or calls through one or more of the one or more router components.

As per claims 12 and 18, Brooks teaches the one or more of the one or more communication devices comprise one or more smart appliances with one or more function, wherein one or more of the one or more second server components direct one or more of the one or more messages [video streaming] or calls through one or more of the one or more router components to trigger one or more of the one or more functions of the one or more smart appliances and the step of sending the one or more messages or calls to the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components (see column 1, lines 20-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar, Conrath, Thompson and Brooks, as they all are from same field endeavor, to provide a scalable system for point to point data streaming, to allow average internet users to deliver their own video or other streaming data over the Internet at minimal setup for a low cost, to provide remote monitoring that allows user to leave the viewer available web page but does not use network bandwidth until the user starts the stream from within the viewer controls and to provide a built in

session tracking system separate from any web server and giving the user direct control over the video stream they are accessing.

8. Claim 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Conrath, Thompson and Brooks as applied to claims 1- 12 and 14-21 above, and further in view of Maes et al U.S. Patent Number 6,801,604 B2 (hereinafter Maes).

As per claim 13, Sridhar discloses one or more server components that employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components, wherein the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of: a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; and a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices.

However, Sridhar is silent about one or more mobile communication devices and wherein upon the determination by the one or more server components of the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components, the one or more mobile communication devices employ an H.323 protocol to communicate one or more messages or calls through the

internet to one or more of the one or more internet protocol address of one or more of the one or more router components.

As per claim 13, Maes teaches one or more mobile communication devices (see column 1, lines 35-56, column 3, lines 50-65;) and wherein upon the determination by the one or more server components of the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components, the one or more mobile communication devices employ an H.323 protocol (see column 10, lines 20-25; column 40, lines 4-33) to communicate one or more messages or calls through the internet to one or more of the one or more internet protocol address of one or more of the one or more router components.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar, Conrath, Thompson, Brooks and Maes, as they all are from same field endeavor, to provide a scalable system for point to point data streaming, to allow average internet users to deliver their own video or other streaming data over the Internet at minimal setup for a low cost, to provide remote monitoring that allows user to leave the viewer available web page but does not use network bandwidth until the user starts the stream from within the viewer controls and to provide a built in session tracking system separate from any web server and giving the user direct control over the video stream they are accessing and provide terminal mobility to the user who is accessing the video streams.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See accompanying PTO 892.

- a. Selective Routing by Raciborski et al, U.S. Patent Number 6,658,000 B1.
- b. Architecture for client- server communication by Verkler et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,157,941 A.

10. A shortened statutory period for reply to this non-final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the applicant (See 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02,71002 (b)).

Contact Information

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saket K. Daftuar whose telephone number is 571-272-8363. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm M-W.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 2151

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SKD


JOHN HOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100